

## R E M A R K S

Claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-30 and 32-35 are currently pending in the application.

All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. As the basis for this rejection, the Examiner states that the word "comprising" is used more than once in the claim. Applicant is not aware of any provision of the patent law which precludes the use of the word "comprising" both in individual claim elements and as a transitional word between the preamble and body of the claim. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner indicates that claims 4-6, 18, 30, 32 and 33 are in allowable form subject to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 being overcome. It is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 2, 14 and 26 stand objected to as each being based upon a rejected based claim. Each of these claims has been rewritten in independent form so as to be allowable.

While claims 15, 27 and 34 are not directly indicated to be allowable in paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Action, it is presumed that the Examiner is treating these claims as allowable since a Statement of Reasons for Allowance in paragraph 11 includes each of these three claims.

Claims 1, 3 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,231,393, (Strickland). It is noted that claim 2 is recognized in paragraph 10 of the Action to be allowable, while it is rejected as anticipated by Strickland in paragraph 5. Claim 2 is being treated as if allowable. Claims 7-11, 13, 16, 17, 23, 24, 28, 29 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Strickland in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,297,353, (Ghalayini).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-11, 13, 24, 26-30 and 32-35 is requested.

In rejecting claim 1 based upon Strickland, the Examiner alleges that the wall 90 in Fig. 4 corresponds to the wall having at least one of a mirrored surface or a blocking surface, as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that the wall 90 is not described by Strickland to have either a mirrored surface or a blocking surface. The wall to which the Examiner refers to is likely clear since there is no reason to block the message therebehind. In any event, Strickland does not teach that this surface be a mirrored or blocking surface. Thus, Strickland does not anticipate claim 1. Since there is no reason for Strickland to obstruct viewing of the message, claim 1 is not obvious from Strickland.

For purposes of clarity, claim 1 has been amended to emphasize that the message is viewable through the mirrored surface or the blocking surface from the first side of the wall once the proximity sensor detects the presence of an individual or object at the first side of the wall.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over Strickland.

Claim 19 characterizes the wall therein as having a mirrored surface or a blocking surface. As noted above, Strickland does not teach or suggest such a surface through which an object at the first side of the wall is viewable from the second side of the wall.

Claim 20 characterizes the wall as having a surface that substantially blocks viewing of an object at the second side through a part of the wall from the first side. In the first state, the message generator causes the first message to be viewable through the part of the wall from the first side of the wall, whereas the first message is unviewable through the

part of the wall from the first side of the wall with the message generator in the second state. Again, Strickland does not teach or suggest any corresponding blocking surface.

Claim 21 likewise recites a wall with a blocking surface, which is absent from Strickland.

Claim 22 depends from claim 20 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over Strickland.

Each of claims 7-11, 16 and 17 depends from claim 1 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the combination of Strickland and Ghalayini.

Claims 13 and 14 each characterizes the mirrored surface as having a convex shape that is a segment of a sphere. The Examiner relies upon Ghalayini for the teaching of a sphere, referring to Figs. 7 and 8 therein. However, in Figs. 7 and 8, Ghalayini discloses a cylinder, rather than a sphere. Thus, even if the teachings of Strickland and Ghalayini are combined, the claimed structure is not arrived at.

Claims 23, 28 and 29 each depends from claim 20 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the combined teachings of Strickland and Ghalayini.

Claim 35 characterizes the wall as having a surface that substantially blocks viewing of an object, which is not taught in, or suggested by, Strickland. Additionally, claim 35 characterizes the message as comprising information providing direction to an observer of the message at the first side of the wall to assist navigation of the space within which the message system is located.

Applicant does not see any teaching in either of the references of a message of this specific nature. Accordingly, claim 35 is believed allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-11, 13-24, 26-30 and 32-35 and allowance of the case are requested.

Enclosed is the extra claim fee of \$300. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our Deposit Account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,  
CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 876-1800

Date: Dec 7, 2005